DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 882 TM 870 406

AUTHOR	Tompkins, John F.; Schnelker, Diane
TITLE	Gifted and Talented Program, 1985-86. Report of Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Des Moines Public Schools, IA. Dept. of Evaluation, Research, and Testing.
PUB DATE	3 Oct 86
NOTE	72p.; For the 1983-84 report, see ED 253 026.
AVAILABLE FROM	Department of Evaluation Research and Testing, Des Moines Independent Community School District, 1800 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, IA 50307-3382.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Budgets; Elementary Education; Expenditures; *Gifted; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Questionnaires; School Demography; *Student Attitudes; *Talent
IDENTIFIERS	*Des Moines Public Schools IA

ABSTRACT

This document presents findings of an evaluation of the Gifted and Talented (G/T) Program serving 860 elementary and secondary school students in the Des Moines (Iowa) Independent Community School District. The evaluation was based on a questionnaire approach designed to gather data from program participants and building coordinators. Comments summarizing the evaluation results included the following: the Central Academy appeared to be a valuable experience for the students involved; specific logistical areas were identified as causing problems for some Central Academy students; and nearly one-third of the students in grades 2 and 3 indicated on the questionnaire that they did not receive assignments different from others in their class. Five recommendations were made: (1) the staff of the Saturday G/T Institute should make every effort to increase the rigor demanded of students; (2) logistical factors should be resolved; (3) an attempt should be made to make more students aware of the contents of the Individual Written Plan; (4) stated goals of the program should be examined to determine whether they are being achieved; and (5) the program administration should take steps to insure that the representation of minority students in the program is increased. Appendices include demographic information and the five instruments used in the evaluation. (LMO)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED284882

REPORT OF EVALUATION

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM

1985-86

Department of Evaluation, Research and Testing
Des Moines Independent Community School District
1800 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50307-3382

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. F Tompkins

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

John F. Tompkins
Program Evaluator

Diane Schnelker
Research and Evaluation Intern

Approved by: Morris D. Wilson

Morris D. Wilson, Ph.D.
Director of Evaluation, Research and Testing

October 3, 1986

TM 870 406

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DES MOINES INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION, RESEARCH AND TESTING
EVALUATION ABSTRACT

October 3, 1986

PROJECT TITLE: Gifted and Talented Program
COORDINATOR: Ron Goodman, 242-7609
STAFF:
1.0 Coordinator
4.0 Elementary Resource Teachers (itinerant)
2.0 Transitional Resource Teachers (itinerant)
2.0 Senior High Resource Teachers (1 itinerant; 1 assigned to Central Campus)
1.0 Teacher/Facilitator (worked with community outreach portion of program)
1.0 Secretary
1.0 Counselor
1.0 Psychologist
TOTAL: 13.0 Positions

POPULATION SERVED:

K-5 ----- 378	G/T Central Academy-----60	
6-8 ----- 219	Saturday Institute------90	
9-12 ---- 263		
Total --- 860	(Includes Academy and Saturday Institute)	

The figures above represent students for whom Individual Written Plans were developed. In addition to these, another 1,832 students were in the "talent pool" and received invitations to various group enrichment experiences.

FUNDING:

Amount Budgeted:

Allowable Growth Funds -----	$526,843.25
Local District Funds -------	190,569.50
Total ----------	$717,412.75

Amount Expended:

Allowable Growth Funds -----	$450,024.69
Local District Funds -------	190,569.50
Total ----------	$640,594.19
Cost Per Pupil:	$ 744.88

COMMENTS:

1. The Central Academy, a newly established portion of the program that served only 8th grade students in 1985-86, appeared to be a valuable experience for the students involved. On a five point scale, (1 = not valuable at all; 5 = very valuable), participants on the average gave the academy a rating of 3.72.

2. Certain specific logistical areas were identified as causing problems for some Central Academy students. Transportation arrangements were reported as a problem by 66.7%. Maintaining ties with the home school was identified as a problem by 58.8%.

3. Building Coordinators, assigned to each building with a Gifted and Talented Program, identify students, coordinate delivery of services and provide for direct services to the students as major activities. As accurately as can be determined through self-report, these individuals concentrate on activities which are listed as required in their job description. One particular activity which was felt by a majority (69.0%) of the building coordinators to be inappropriate was providing transportation to program activities.

4. Nearly one third (30%) of the students in grades 2 and 3 who responded to a questionnaire indicated that they did not receive assignments different from others in their class. Although the G/T goals discourage an overemphasis on in-class differentiation of students, it would seem that a higher percentage of students should be aware of some differentiation in classroom activities.

5. Forty-four percent of the students in grades 4-12 responding to a survey reported that 67.6 percent of the projects or activities that they worked on were described in their written plan. The other 32.4 percent of the projects listed, however, were not part of the plan or the student did not know what was on the plan. While diversions from the plan are allowed and even encouraged in some cases, more students should be at least familiar with what the plan contains and realize that it is intended to serve as a guideline for enrichment activities. Otherwise, it's purpose becomes dubious.

6. Students received assistance from a variety of sources to complete projects and activities. Of the students who responded in grades 2 and 3, 70% reported the resource teacher as particularly helpful. In grades 4-12, 54.8% reported the building coordinator as being very helpful.

7. Nearly one half (49%) of the students in the program sampled reported that community resources were used to assist in the completion of projects and activities.

8. Over 86% of the students sampled in grades 4-12 reported that the projects or activities they engaged in allowed for pursuit of their interests.

9. Students in grades 4-12 completed a five point scale which asked to what extent they felt they had benefited from participation in the program. On a scale of 1 to 5 with "1" indicating that the program was not at all valuable to "5" indicating that the program was a very valuable experience, students in grades 4-5 gave an average response of 4.20. The average for those in grades 6-8 was 4.04 and for those in grades 9-12, 3.76.

10. The percent of minority students participating in this program is disproportionate to the percent of minority students enrolled in the district. While 17.5 percent of the district enrollment is composed of minority students, only 8.3 percent of the Gifted and Talented Program enrollment is made up of same.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The staff of the Saturday G/T Institute should make every effort to increase the rigor demanded of students since the students, themselves, feel the program is only slightly more rigorous than that demanded at their home schools.

2. Logistical factors such as transportation, scheduling and maintenance of ties with the home school were perceived to cause problems for a number of students that attended the Central Academy. It is recommended that the program coordinator take the steps necessary to resolve these problems to the greatest degree possible during the 1986-87 school year.

3. An attempt should be made to make more students aware of the contents of their Individual Written Plan (IWP). While the program permits modification in the plan according to need, students should have a basic familiarity with its contents and be prepared to follow it as a guideline for planning activities.

4. During the 1986-87 school year, the stated goals of this program should be examined to determine whether or not they are being achieved. Some of the goals may need to be stated in more measurable terms to be successfully evaluated. The Department of Evaluation, Research and Testing will assist in this endeavor if requested.

5. It is recommended that the program administration take steps to insure that the representation of minority students in the Gifted and Talented Program is increased. While the number of minority students in the district comprises 17.5 percent of the total district enrollment, the number of minority students in the Gifted and Talented Program make up only 8.3 percent of the program's enrollment.

A copy of the complete Evaluation Report is available upon request from the Department of Evaluation Research and Testing, 1800 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50307-3382.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The stated goals of the Gifted and Talented Program are as follows:

1. To coordinate and articulate services for students that are appropriate throughout the entire public school experience.

2. To identify students by valid and reliable measures that are as objective as the various areas of giftedness permit and that are applied impartially and consistently throughout the school system.

3. To provide an educational program which will enable each gifted child to develop his/her abilities to the fullest potential.

4. To provide learning alternatives which are appropriately tailored to encourage individual growth at varying levels of ability, interests and needs.

5. To provide guidance, teaching, and support service personnel appropriately trained to help accomplish identification, programming, and evaluation goals of the program.

6. To reward outcomes that motivate gifted children to continue to do what benefits them.

7. To establish means of regular communication about the talented and gifted program among staff members and between the school and the home.

8. To evaluate the program systematically for the purpose of making decisions relative to program modification.

The Des Moines Talented and Gifted Program underwent numerous modifications during the 1983-84 school year due to a legislated funding mechanism known as "allowable growth." Under the allowable growth plan, Iowa districts submitting proposals which meet a specified set of criteria are allowed to exceed their controlled budgets by an amount equal to as much as 75 percent of the cost of those projects. This growth in the controlled budgets is authorized by the School Budget Review Committee (SBRC) upon notification that the district has met the specified criteria. By February 15 of each year the SBRC conveys to the State Comptroller a list of districts receiving such authorization and the amounts of allowable growth to be allocated to each. The comptroller's office, in turn, conveys to the appropriate county treasurers the amount

of extra money to be raised in each district for gifted and talented programs. Thus, in reality, allowable growth funding is an increase in local property taxes to support programs. Because of this, no state money is allocated to gifted and talented programs in local districts. The Des Moines Gifted and Talented Program completed its third year under allowable growth funding in 1985-86.

The program staff included the following fulltime positions:

- one program coordinator
- one community outreach facilitator
- four elementary resource teachers
- two transitional resource teachers
- two senior high resource teachers
- one secretary
- one psychologist
- one counselor

The psychologist and counselor were added to the staff during the 1985-86 school year. Psychological services had been contracted in previous years. Each building also has a gifted and talented building coordinator who receives a stipend for assuming program responsibilities in his/her building.

The program strives to identify gifted and talented youngsters from kindergarten through high school. Identification takes place in one or more of the following categories: intellectual ability, specific academic aptitude, creative thinking, leadership, and visual and performing arts. Identification is conducted on a building-by-building basis. Each G/T category has several screening criteria. Pertinent data are assembled for each student in each category for which he/she

has been recommended. A building team reviews the data and makes the final determination regarding students to be served.

Individual Written Plans are prepared for all identified students. The total number of identified students may not exceed 3 percent of the number of students enrolled in the district. It is also expected that the number of students identified by building will not exceed 3 percent of that building's enrollment. The Individual Written Plans take into account student needs and interests. A district staff person, often a classroom teacher, shares the responsibility with the student for the completion of the plan. The gifted and talented staff also provides necessary support to facilitate completion of the IWP's. This support takes many forms. In some cases, the resource teacher provides guidance and materials to the classroom teacher. In other cases the resource teacher serves as an important source of information about special programs and opportunities to foster the development of students. These programs may be offered through the district or through community organizations. Many students also receive direct instruction from resource teachers on either a short-term or an ongoing basis.

The community resources facilitator sets up group or individual experiences which help students accomplish the objectives of their IWP. In some cases these may take the form of ongoing, high level mentorships with community professionals in the area of interest.

Sometimes student needs will be greatest in the area of counseling and guidance. The program seeks to provide services to meet the counseling and guidance needs as well. Efforts include increasing

district staff awareness of the needs of gifted students and/or appropriate means of meeting these needs and providing information and support to the parents of gifted youngsters.

CENTRAL ACADEMY

The Central Academy was established in 1985-86 as a program option designed to provide a challenging, fast paced academic curriculum for students with exceptional scholastic abilities. Students spend half of each school day (three periods) at the Central Academy located at the Central Campus building, 1800 Grand Avenue. The remainder of their program (three periods), including at least one academic course, is taken in the home school.

Academy courses are offered in four of the major academic disciplines: social science, science, math and language arts. They differ from regular curriculum offerings in one or more of the following ways: accelerated pacing, compacted course content, course offered at an earlier level, greater depth of coverage, or a modified instructional approach.

During the initial year, the program served eighth grade students in the afternoon only. Future plans include expanding the program to grades 6-12.

THE DES MOINES GIFTED AND TALENTED INSTITUTE

The Gifted and Talented Institute is offered to students in grades 6 through 12, and is designed to provide students access to facilities, resources and an environment in which to pursue their goals and interests. The activities, projects and studies of the participants are more comprehensive and rigorous than those undertaken in the regular classroom. The intent is not only to provide the students with the resources

necessary to pursue high level research projects, but to expose them to critical aspects of studies in the sciences and humanities.

The Institute is divided into two departments: Math and Science and Humanities. Both departments met for ten sessions on Saturday mornings. During the 1985-86 school year, the Department of Humanities offered resource and discussion seminars in the following areas: the nuclear age, visual and performing arts in a technological age, an impact study of changing male and female roles, and forecasting the future. The 1986 Math and Science Institute offered sessions in biology, chemistry, observable and theoretical astronomy, probability and statistics, computer applications, research studies in water pollution and treatment and independent research.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAM

This component of the Gifted and Talented Program is operated by a fulltime staff member. It originated during 1981-82 as a program funded by the Northwest Area Foundation known as Community Caring for the Gifted. The following activities are undertaken in the program:

- Arranging mentorships for students with interests that go beyond the scope of the school system.
- Arranging classes to meet the needs of G/T youngsters. These are commonly taught by either school or community people, and are generally offered after school or on Saturdays.
- Arranging experiences in the community for G/T students. An example might by a visit to a veterinary clinic for students interested in veterinary medicine.

- Providing information to identified students and building coordinators about opportunities in our community.
- Planning and coordinating the implementation of summer opportunities such as special music programs and G/T Summer Camp.
- Conducting classes for parents of G/T youngsters. The classes increase parent understanding of the traits and needs of high ability children.

PULLOUT PROGRAM

The elementary pullout program was initiated in the Spring of 1986 to provide supplementary challenges to high ability students. Students spent one half day each week for 5 weeks in class sized groups of their intellectual peers developing process skills that may not have been emphasized to the same extent in their regular classes. In 1985-86 the elementary pull out activities focused on "Tools for Learning and Living" which included critical thinking, creative thinking, communication, research and leadership skills. Students also addressed concerns about self-concepts and understanding their own talents and abilities.

The half day sessions were organized by grade (i.e., K-1-2, 3, 4, 5), and were held at 6 regional centers, namely Brooks, Findley, Greenwood, Howe, Watrous and Woodlawn.

A key feature of the G/T program is its identification process which includes two major steps: (1) screening; and (2) selection. This process is described in the following section:

IDENTIFICATION

The building principal is primarily responsible for the identification of the talented and gifted population in each building.

Implementation of screening and selection processes are carried out by a building team of 3 - 10 persons including teachers and support personnel such as counselors and psychologists. Identification procedures--both screening and selection--are ongoing. Students may, in fact, be identified whenever they are found.

Screening Process

The first step in the identification procedure is to identify a pool of possible candidates. This pool may consist of no more than 10-20% the school population. Acceptance to the pool is based on data from the following sources: (a) Information in cumulative records, i.e. standardized test scores; (b) Information from other school records, i.e., Systematic Approach to Reading Instruction (SARI) charts, objectives based test results; (c) Teacher nomination because of indicators other than test scores; (d) Acceptance of parent nomination; and (e) Nominations from counselors, psychologists and other support personnel.

To assure consistency throughout the district, there is district-wide screening at the end of the following grades: first, third, fifth and eighth.

Selection Process

From the identification pool, each building team selects candidates for the G/T program. The total number of participants in the GT program may not exceed 3% of the student population of that building.

Students are "identified" as gifted and talented in one or more of the five categories in the Baldwin Identification Matrix. Selection for the program is determined by evaluating the information recorded on the matrix according to the following guidelines:

1. Students with maximum scores are placed in the building program;
2. Other high ranking students are considered by the building team using available data. Primary consideration is given to determining which students require differentiated programs and/or services beyond those provided by the regular school program.
3. Teams may select students who do not meet certain standards for participation. The rationale for doing so, however, must be documented in writing.
4. "Need" and "potential benefit" refer to:
   - -degree of giftedness
   - -concern for whether potential is being fulfilled in present program
   - -awareness of culturally different populations
   - -task commitment
   - -capacity for production of new information as contrasted with being a consumer of information
5. Delivery of services (placement in program) should be allocated to the 3% in a building who need it most. Identification is for program placement rather than labeling.

Figure 1 displays demographic information about the Gifted and Talented Program. Prior to the implementation of this evaluation design, a request was made to the Department of Evaluation, Research and Testing that student participation by race be tabulated. Figure 1 is meant to be a summary of program demographics. More detailed information related to each building may be found in Appendix A.

FIGURE I

Demographic Information - Minority Enrollment
Des Moines Gifted and Talented Program*

Level	District Percent of Minority Students	G/T Program Percent of Minority Students
Elementary (1-5)	17.2	7.9
Transitional (6-8)	18.4	8.7
Senior High (9-12)	17.4	8.4
Total (1-12)	17.5	8.3

*District percentages from Educational Services Division Des Moines Public Schools, September 13, 1985. Program percentages from information supplied by the Program Coordinator in January, 1986.

According to Figure 1, minority students compose 8.3 percent of the students who participate in the Gifted and Talented Program although they represent 17.5 percent of the district's enrollment. The program administration should take steps to insure that the representation of minority students in the Gifted and Talented Program is increased.

Further information of a descriptive nature may be obtained from a report entitled "updating into the Eighties: A Des Moines Plan for Gifted and Talented Education." This report was included as an appendix to the Report of Evaluation: Gifted and Talented Program 1983-84 and is available upon request from the Department of Evaluation, Research and Testing. Appendix A includes demographic information regarding the population of students served by this program.

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

Figures 2 and 3 present the budget for the Gifted and Talented Program. The figures were provided by the project coordinator and Controller's office and reflect operational costs for the 1985-86 school year.

FIGURE 2

ALLOWABLE GROWTH FUNDS
(As of August 7, 1986)

CATEGORY	AMOUNT BUDGETED	AMOUNT EXPENDED
Salaries and Benefits	$369,796.25	$297,326.18
Professional Services	26,626.00	38,353.04
Mentorships	15,000.00	5,237.92
Inservice Training	20,396.00	22,636.01
Transportation and Travel	6,750.00	9,799.35
Special Student Events	23,500.00	20,622.87
Supplies and Equipment	42,775.00	39,812.16
Summer Program	22,000.00	16,237.16
TOTAL	$526,843.25	$450,024.69

FIGURE 3

DISTRICT FUNDS

(As of August 7, 1986)

CATEGORY	AMOUNT BUDGETED	AMOUNT EXPENDED
Professional Salaries	$113,182.50	$113,182.50
Indirect Costs	72,587.00	72,587.00
Evaluation	4,800.00	4,800.00
TOTAL	$190.569.50	$190,569.50
GRAND TOTAL	$717,412.75	$640,594.19

These figures indicate that $640,594.19 was expended. This represented 89.3 percent of the amount budgeted. It should be noted that the majority of the unspent funds occurred in the salaries and benefits category. The cost per pupil for the 860 students served in was $744.88.

EVALUATION DESIGN AND RESULTS

As with the 1983-84 evaluations, the 1985-86 evaluation relies primarily on input fromm students and building coordinators. However, because this evaluation is the third year of implementation, the questions on both surveys focused on evaluating the impact of the program rather than the consistency of implementation. A questionnaire, rather than an interview, approach was employed in the 1985-86 evaluation to increase the representativeness of the sample.

The 1985-86 evaluation design was developed by the program evaluator and the research and evaluation intern in consultation with the Gifted and Talented Program Coordinator. The design included the following components:

(1) questionnaires were sent to <u>all</u> students in the program with the exception of those in grade 1. First graders (only twelve students) were eliminated because of a possible inability to interpret and respond to the questionnaire. Different forms of the questionnaire were generated for students in grades 2 and 3 and in grades 4 - 12;

(2) questionnaires were sent to <u>all</u> building coordinators;

(3) questionnaires were sent to <u>all</u> students who participated in the Gifted and Talented Institute;

(4) questionnaires were sent to <u>all</u> students who participated in the Gifted and Talented Central Academy.

Appendix B contains a copy of each of the questionnaires sent out in April 1986. As of the final day of the 1985-86 school year (June 4), questionnaires had been returned as indicated in Figure 4:

FIGURE 4

1985-86 G/T Program Evaluation Instruments

Questionnaire	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Academy Questionnaire	60	37	61.7
Institute Questionnaire	90	50	55.6
Building Coordinator Questionnaire	58	38	65.5
Student Questionnaire (Grades 2 - 3)	153	120	78.4
Student Questionnaire (Grades 4 - 12)	716	321	44.8

Figure 4 indicates that the return rates for the various questionnaires ranged from 44.8 percent to 78.4 percent of those sent out. While the higher the rate of return the better, a rate of 30 percent or more of the number of questionnaires sent out is usually considered acceptable for generalizing the results from a sample to the population they represent.

To facilitate reporting, the results of each questionnaire are reported separately. General conclusions and recommendations that they suggest follow.

CENTRAL ACADEMY STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire was sent to all sixty students who were enrolled in the academy. Thirty-seven or 61.7 percent of the students returned the questionnaires. Twenty-five (41.7 percent) were participants in the regular Gifted and Talented Program. The remainder are presumed to be in the "talent pool".

Students attending the academy (eighth grade only in 1985-86) had the option of enrolling in either a social science/language arts block or a science/language arts block. Of the thirty-seven students who responded to the questionnaire, twenty-five or 67.6 percent selected science/language arts while twelve (32.4 percent) chose social science/ language arts. As a third academy course, students had the option of enrolling in algebra, geometry or Spanish. Thirty-two (86.5 percent) selected algebra. Four others (10.8 percent) enrolled in geometry while only one student selected Spanish. It would seem to be desirable that as the academy expands to allow participation by students in other grades, a better balance in the numbers of students enrolled in the various courses might be achieved.

Of the thirty-seven respondents, thirty-five (94.6 percent) reported that academy classes differed from those in the home school. Many of the respondents reported that the classes were faster paced and more challenging.

Students were asked to evaluate factors related to participation in the academy such as transportation, scheduling and maintaining close ties with the home school. While only one of thirty six respondents felt that transportation arrangements were very unsatisfactory, twenty-four (66.7 percent) experienced some difficulties. Only 11 (30.6 percent) were completedly satisfied with the transportation arrangements.

Participation in the academy also appears to complicate scheduling of other classes. Eight of the respondents (22.2 percent) classified the problems encountered as "major" while fourteen others (38.9 percent) said the problems were of some significance. This means that a total of 61.1 percent of the academy respondents felt that scheduling was a problem; certainly enough to warrant investigation.

Thirty-four students responded to a statement concerning maintenance of ties with the home school. Five students (14.7 percent) felt that they experienced a very difficult time maintaining close ties at their present home school while fifteen (44.1 percent) said that this was somewhat difficult. This left fourteen (41.2 percent) indicating no problems in maintaining ties. While it may be difficult to isolate the reasons for difficulties experienced by students in this area, some concern is certainly warranted, particularly since this area has been deemed important by the program planners.

Students were asked to rate the amount of overall benefit obtained from participation in the academy on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 indicated "no benefit" to 5 indicated "much benefit". The average response for the 36 returns was 3.72 indicating that on the average, students received moderate benefits from this program.

Students were asked if they would recommend the academy to other qualified students. Twenty-two (59.5 percent) of the respondents stated that they would recommend the Central Academy to qualified peers while 5 (13.5 percent) stated that they would not. Ten others (27.0 percent) were uncertain of their recommendation.

Very similar responses were obtained when the students were asked if they desired to participate in the academy again. Twenty-three students (62.2 percent) stated that they would enroll in the Central Academy again. Only one student was unsure, though thirteen (35.1 percent) did not desire to participate again.

At the conclusion of the survey, students were asked to record potential obstacles or conflicts in continued enrollment in the Academy. Conflicts or obstacles foreseen in many cases dealt with difficulties scheduling classes offered at the home school. Several students indicated that academy classes interfered with participation in band (at the home school).

The following is a sample of general comments students made regarding the Central Academy:

> "I feel that if I wouldn't have gone to the Academy I would have missed out on a better education and also a lot of fun. I've enjoyed making friends which I wouldn't have met without the Academy".
>
> "I enjoy the upbeat, faster moving classes that leave more time for social and extracurricular activities. I also think the smaller classes give the teachers more time to make sure the kids understand the course."
>
> "Should be abolished!"

MATH/SCIENCE, HUMANITIES INSTITUTE

Student Questionnaire

Ninety students in grades 6 though 12 attended sessions of either the Math and Sciences or Humanities Institute during the 1985-86 school year. Fifty of the attendees (55.6 percent) returned the questionnaires making for a return rate similar to that experienced with the Central Academy questionnaire (61.7 percent). A copy of the questionnaire is contained in Appendix B.

Table 1 indicates the sessions offered through the Humanities and Math/Science Institutes. Ten of the fifty respondents attended the Humanities Institute (all except one attended two sessions) while the remainder participated in the Math/Science Institute.

TABLE 1
HUMANITIES AND MATH/SCIENCE INSTITUTE
STUDENT ATTENDANCE

NAME OF SESSION	INSTITUTE	NUMBER ATTENDING
The Nuclear Age	Math/Science	6
Visual and Performing Arts in a Technological Age	Humanities	4
Technological Impact of Changing Male and Female Role	Humanities	4
Forecasting the Future	Humanities	5
Biology	Math/Science	13
Chemistry	Math/Science	8
Observable and Theoretical Astronomy	Math/Science	5
Computer Applications	Math/Science	11
Probability and Statistics	Math/Science	1
Research Studies in Water Pollution and Treatment	Math/Science	0
Independent Research	Math/Science	3

Students were asked to evaluate the stated goals of the Institute on a 5 point scale. Responses were coded from -2 which indicated a strong disagreement to a +2 which indicated strong agreement. Table 2 reports the average responses obtained.

TABLE 2
MATH/SCIENCE, HUMANITIES INSTITUTE
STUDENT OPINIONNAIRE

Item	Number of Responses	Average Response
The Institute provided access to facilities and resources that enable me to pursue special interests	50	+1.04
Interactions among students was actively encouraged in sessions/ seminars	50	+0.54
The activities, projects and studies engaged in were more rigorous than those undertaken in the classroom	50	+0.48
The activities, projects and studies undertaken were in my opinion, critical aspects of the studies of the humanities and/or the sciences.	49	+0.80

Table 2 suggests that students only moderately agreed that the program was implemented as specified by the goals. The statement with the greatest degree of agreement was "The Institute provided access to facilities and resources that enabled me to pursue special interests." That with the least agreement was "The activities, projects and studies engaged in were more rigorous than those undertaken in the classroom." This response would indicate that the institute staff should increase the rigor demanded of students. If the academy is no more rigorous or demanding--according to the students themselves--than their regular school programs, the expense and inconvenience can hardly be justified.

Students were asked to rate the benefit of participating in the Gifted and Talented Institute on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = no benefit and 5 = much benefit). The average rating of the 50 respondents was 3.76 indicating respondents did feel they benefited from the Institute even though they did not feel strongly that the Institute met its goals.

Students made a variety of suggestions for future Math/Science, Humanities Institutes. Many had to do with a specific course which they desired to take.

The final question on the Institute survey asked students if they would desire to participate in future Gifted and Talented Institute programs. Forty-one of the fifty students (82.0 percent) indicated that they would participate in future institutes. Eight (16.0 percent) were not sure of their decision while only one student (2.0 percent) indicated no desire for future participation.

Twenty-six of the fifty participants provided comments concerning various aspects of the program. While a number of these related to a specific session attended, some had overtones that applied to the program in general. Comments included:

"Very good teachers. Please thank whoever got this program together."

"I enjoyed the Institute greatly."

"I would like to see possibly a main center for the Math/Science, Humanities Institute where all the classes would be held."

"Criterium (sic) should be set up to find experienced, knowledgeable instructors who utilize all resources at their disposal, and who could offer participating students the advanced learning environment the Institute was designed to offer."

"I absolutely love the Institute. I've been in G/T since 3rd grade, but never felt that I was being truly challenged. The Institute is the challenge I've been looking for..."

BUILDING COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

For the second consecutive year, all Gifted and Talented Building Coordinators were asked to complete a questionnaire. The items on the questionnaire were based heavily on the job description for the building coordinator and were designed to assess the following: (a) the approximate amount of time spent on each activity; (b) whether the activities were deemed "appropriate" by the building coordinator; and (c) the degree to which the building coordinator felt these activities facilitated the operation of the 1985-86 program in his or her building.

The results of the survey are found in Figure 5. The following explanations are provided to facilitate their interpretation:

ACTIVITY

Lists each activity in the building coordinator job description. The letters that appear in parenthesis following the activity description indicate whether the activity is "required" (R) or "suggested" (S).

TIME

Shows how the coordinators categorized each activity according to the amount of time spent on it. Categories included: major (consuming 30 percent or more of the time spent working on all Gifted and Talented activites during the school year; intermediate (consuming at least 10 percent, but not more than 30 percent of the time spent on all activities, and minor (consuming less than 10 percent of the time spent on all Gifted and Talented activities during the current school year), or N/A (not engaged in).

APPROPRIATENESS

Shows the percent of respondents who felt that the activity was appropriate (should be a building coordinator's responsibility) or inappropriate (should not be a building coordinator's responsibility).

FACILITATION

Shows the average rating on a 5 point scale of the degree to which the building coordinators believed each activity facilitated the successful operation of the Gifted and Talented Program in their building. The rating points ranged from 1 = none to 5 = much with "NA" indicating not applicable.

FIGURE 5
GIFTED AND TALENTED BUILDING COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE
1985-86

Activities	Time	Appropriateness	Facilitation
1. Maintain student files (R)	31.6 Major 47.4 Inter 21.1 Minor 0.0 N/A	94.4 Appropriate 5.6 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5 3.5
2. Distribute information to identified students.(R)			
a. 3%	33.3 Major 58.3 Inter 8.3 Minor 0.0 N/A	94.6 Appropriate 5.4 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5 4.3
b. Gifted and Talented Pool	27.8 Major 38.9 Inter 33.3 Minor 0.0 N/A	100.0 Appropriate 0.0 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5 4.1
3. Insure that parent permission has been obtained before testing. (R)	13.9 Major 38.9 Inter 38.9 Minor 8.3 N/A	94.3 Appropriate 5.7 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5 4.2
4. Submit write ups of noteworthy building programs and events to building newsletters and other media. (S)	5.6 Major 13.9 Inter 44.4 Minor 36.1 N/A	90.3 Appropriate 9.7 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5 3.2
5. Coordinate delivery of services to identified students with:			
a. Building staff (R)	52.6 Major 29.0 Inter 13.2 Minor 5.3 N/A	100.0 Appropriate 0.0 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5 4.6
b. Gifted and Talented resource teachers (R)	48.7 Major 32.4 Inter 16.2 Minor 2.7 N/A	100.0 Appropriate 0.0 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5 4.6

c. Parents	(R)	23.7 Major 29.0 Inter 47.4 Minor 0.0 N/A	97.2 Appropriate 2.8 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	4.1
d. Volunteers	(R)	11.1 Major 13.9 Inter 25.0 Minor 50.0 N/A	85.2 Appropriate 14.8 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	4.3
6. Coordinate support and/or supervision for those providing Gifted and Talented student programs	(S)	25.7 Major 31.4 Inter 31.4 Minor 11.4 N/A	96.6 Appropriate 3.4 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	4.3
7. Arrange staff inservice as needed	(S)	5.3 Major 7.0 Inter 47.4 Minor 39.5 N/A	89.7 Appropriate 10.3 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	3.7
8. Conduct staff inservice as needed	(S)	10.5 Major 2.6 Inter 39.5 Minor 47.4 N/A	77.8 Appropriate 22.2 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	3.4
9. Arrange student transportation to Gifted and Talented experiences	(S)	5.4 Major 13.5 Inter 48.7 Minor 32.4 N/A	59.4 Appropriate 40.6 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	3.9
10. Provide student transportation to Gifted and Talented experiences	(S)	2.7 Major 5.4 Inter 35.1 Minor 56.8 N/A	31.0 Appropriate 69.0 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	3.6
11. Identify building students following district procedures	(R)	56.8 Major 29.7 Inter 10.8 Minor 2.7 N/A	100.0 Appropriate 0.0 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	4.7
12. Screen building records for identification purposes	(R)	43.2 Major 35.1 Inter 16.2 Minor 5.4 N/A	97.1 Appropriate 2.9 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	4.2
13. Arrange for direct services to students through pull-out or other programs	(S)	36.8 Major 31.6 Inter 15.8 Minor 15.8 N/A	100.0 Appropriate 0.0 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	4.4

14.	Provide for direct services to students through pull-out or other programs (S)	44.7 Major 10.5 Inter 23.7 Minor 21.1 N/A	84.4 Appropriate 15.6 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	4.3
15.	Provide leadership for building teams (R)	31.6 Major 29.0 Inter 36.8 Minor 2.6 N/A	100.0 Appropriate 0.0 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	3.9
16.	Prepare reports and lists as needed or according to indicated time schedules (R)	39.5 Major 42.1 Inter 15.8 Minor 2.6 N/A	100.0 Appropriate 0.0 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	3.7
17.	Assist teachers in writing IWP's (R)	21.6 Major 35.1 Inter 24.3 Minor 18.9 N/A	90.3 Appropriate 9.7 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	4.0
18.	Arrange parent meetings when appropriate (S)	5.3 Major 10.5 Inter 42.1 Minor 42.1 N/A	93.6 Appropriate 6.4 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	3.6
19.	Conduct parent meetings when appropriate (S)	10.5 Major 5.3 Inter 34.2 Minor 47.4 N/A	82.1 Appropriate 17.9 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	3.5
20.	Communicate program's needs and information to building teams, staff and resource teachers (R)	29.0 Major 29.0 Inter 42.1 Minor 0.0 N/A	100.0 Appropriate 0.0 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	4.2
21.	Provide opportunities for students to share their products with appropriate audiences (R)	5.3 Major 31.6 Inter 57.9 Minor 5.3 N/A	94.3 Appropriate 5.7 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	3.4
22.	Help teachers locate student and professional materials relating to Gifted and Talented (S)	5.3 Major 21.1 Inter 63.2 Minor 10.5 N/A	85.7 Appropriate 14.3 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	3.2
23.	Attend meetings and inservice programs concerning Gifted Education (R)	10.5 Major 39.5 Inter 47.4 Minor 2.6 N/A	94.4 Appropriate 5.6 Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	4.1

The job description for the building coordinator indicates that some activities are "required" while others are only "suggested" and may or may not be undertaken depending on the nature of the program at a particular building. This follows with the philosophy of the program which establishes certain guidelines and requirements but also grants latitude in operation at the building level.

Those activities which the highest percentage of building coordinators classified as major were: identifying building students following district procedures (56.8 percent), coordinating delivery of services to identified students with building staff (52.6 percent) and with resource teachers (48.7 percent) and providing for direct services to students through pull-out or other programs (44.7 percent). Those which the highest percentage of building coordinators classified as minor were: help teachers locate students and professional materials relating to Gifted and Talented (63.2 percent), provide opportunities for students to share their products with appropriate audiences (57.9 percent), arrange student transportation to Gifted and Talented experiences (48.7 percent) and attend meetings and inservice programs concerning Gifted education (47.4 percent). Major activities were considered to be those consuming 30 percent or more of the time spent on all program activities while minor activities were those consuming less than 10 percent of the time spent on all activities. The building coordinators also reported activities listed that were not engaged in. There were several activities in the job description

that many building coordinators do not appear to engage in at all. These include: providing students transportation to Gifted and Talented experiences (56.8 percent indicated "not applicable"), conducting parent meetings when appropriate (47.4 percent), and conducting staff inservice as appropriate (47.4 percent). It should be noted that all of the activities to which a high percentage of building coordinators indicated that they did not engage in were listed on the job description as "suggested". It did not appear that any of the required activities were being ignored though some were only engaged in a small portion of time.

The perceptions of building coordinators concerning the appropriateness of each activity as a building coordinator's responsibility were also gathered. Virtually all of the respondents felt that the following activities were appropriate: distributing information to identified students, coordinating delivery of services to identified students with building staff and Gifted and Talented resource teachers, identifying building students following district procedures, arranging for direct services to students through pullout or other programs, providing leadership for building teams, preparing reports and lists as needed and communicating the needs and information for the program to building team staff and resource teacher.

In other instances some building coordinators indicated that they did not feel an activity was appropriate. These included: conducting staff inservice as appropriate (22.2 percent indicated this as inappropriate), arranging student transportation to Gifted and Talented experiences (40.6 percent) and providing transportaiton to Gifted and Talented experiences (69.0).

Finally, coordinators were asked to rate the degree to which they felt each activity facilitated the successful operation of the program in the building on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = "none", 5 = "much"). The building coordinators, on the average, rated all of the activities in a range from 3.2 to 4.6. Those which contributed least were "submitting writeups of noteworthy building programs and events to building newsletters and other media" and "helping teachers locate student and professional materials relating to Gifted and Talented." Both received an average rating of 3.2. Those facilitating the most were coordinating delivery of services to identified students with building staff and with Gifted and Talented resource teachers. Both received an average of 4.6.

In the final section of the survey, building coordinators were asked several questions designed to ascertain how much time they spent each week working both directly with Gifted and Talented students and on program activities other than work with students. A copy of these questions may be found in Appendix B. Table 3 reports the results as provided by respondents.

TABLE 3
BUILDING COORDINATOR
ENGAGEMENT RATES
(Percent of Coordinators in each Category)

	AMOUNT OF TIME					
Activity	Less than 1 Hr/Wk	1-2 Hrs/Wk	2-3 Hrs/Wk	3-4 Hrs/Wk	4-5 Hrs/Wk	More than 5 Hrs/Wk
Direct work with Students	44.1	38.9	2.8	5.6	8.3	N/A
Other Program Activities	5.4	51.4	21.6	10.8	8.1	1.7

Nearly half (44.1 percent) of the respondents indicated that they spent less than one hour per week working directly with students. Slightly fewer (38.9 percent) spent from 1 to 2 hours per week working directly with students. Fewer coordinators reported working with students from 2-3 hours (2.8 percent), 3-4 hours (5.6 percent) and 4-5 hours (8.3 percent).

Building coordinators tended to engage in "other" Gifted and Talented program activities slightly more. Only 5.4% reported spending less than one hour. Other amounts of time reported were as follows: 1-2 hours - 51.4%, 2-3 hours - 21.6%, 3-4 hours - 10.8%, 4-5 hours - 8.1% and more than 5 hours 2.7%.

Coordinators were also asked how much time per week was made available (i.e., released) to carry out assigned duties as building coordinator and to work directly with Gifted and Talented students. As the questionnaire did not specify units of time in which to categorize responses, it was not possible to determine an average amount of time spent. It is significant to note however, that 29 of the 38 respondents (76.3%) replied that no amount of time was released for either working directly with students or on other program activities. This indicates that the building coordinators are, to a large extent, conducting such activities during planning times, before or after school, etc. It should be noted that building coordinators do receive a yearly stipend as compensation for their additional duties.

Finally, building coordinators were invited to record comments concerning any aspect of the program. Samples of comments included the following:

"The program's success is built on a good and dedicated team of interested people. The task is monumental in high school and our building's success is built on a strong team and an appreciative/supportive principal."

"I would like to have the resource teacher in the building more than once every two weeks."

"There is too much emphasis and dependency on volunteers who are not really qualified. Our G/T kids deserve better."

"G/T coordinators need more time on a weekly basis to meet with all G/T students to reinforce classroom objectives on the IWP's and to supplement other materials for special projects."

"I think this is a fine program. I deal with alot of staff apathy and their opinion that I should do the kids' projects in pullout. I wish we had a motivational speaker to show them that it need not be difficult to enrich these kids using regular curriculum."

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE - GRADES 2 AND 3

The student questionnaire for grades 2 and 3 was sent to all students in the regular program in these grades - 153 according to information provided by the program coordinator's office. The questionnaire was returned by 120 students or 78.4 percent. This questionnaire is shorter and contains less complex questions than the one for grades 4 - 12. It was felt that students at these grade levels might experience some difficulty in interpreting the survey developed for those in grades 4 - 12.

Students were initially asked if they received classroom assignments that were different from other students. This question was asked in an attempt to determine to what extent differential curriculum activities were provided to these students. Of the 55 second grade students, 42 or 76.4 percent indicated that they did receive differential assignments. Of the 65 third grade students who returned the questionnaire, 42 (64.6 percent) stated that they received assignments different from others in their class. Combining the results from second and third grade, 84 (70 percent) of the respondents reported differences in classroom assignments. While this represents the majority of students, it would appear unusual that 30 percent of the students in the regular program say that they don't receive assignments different from the others.

To obtain a perception of the number of Gifted and Talented students in a typical second or third grade classroom, students were simply asked how many other Gifted and Talented students were in their regular class. The range for second grade was from 0 (reported by 5 students) to 10 with an average of 3.1. Third grade results were very similar with a range from 0 (6 students) to 9 with an average of 3.3.

As a follow up to this question, students were asked if they worked with the other G/T students in their own class and with those in other classes. In second grade, of the students who stated that there were other G/T students in the class, 38 (76 percent) said that they worked with these students on special projects. In third grade 44 of the 59 students (74.6 percent) who reported other Gifted and Talented students in their class reported that they worked together.

There is also evidence that 2nd and 3rd grade students in the Gifted and Talented Program work with students in other classes at the same grade level as well as with students in other grades. Of the 2nd grade respondents 49 (89.1 percent) reported working with other second grade classes. All but two of these students reported that they also worked with students from other grades. For 3rd grade, 57 (87.7 percent) reported working with students from other classes, while 43 of these reported working with students from other grades.

As a final question, students were asked which adults helped them complete projects or activities related to the Gifted and Talented Program. The categories of responses are listed in Table 4 and are accompanied by the percent of students that responded in each. It should be noted that most students checked more than one category and some checked all.

TABLE 4
ASSISTANCE FROM ADULTS
IN COMPLETION OF PROJECTS FOR
STUDENTS IN GRADES 2-3

	Second Grade (55 Respondents)	
	Number	Percent
Homeroom teacher	31	56.4
Teacher other than Homeroom teacher	30	54.6
Resource teacher	39	70.9
Parent	35	63.6
Other	19	34.6

	Third Grade (65 Respondents)	
	Number	Percent
Homeroom teacher	36	55.4
Teacher other than homeroom teacher	35	53.8
Resource teacher	39	60.0
Parent	40	61.5
Other	28	43.1

Both second and third grade students reported receiving assistance from several sources with their program activities. Nearly 71 percent of the 2nd grade students and 60 percent of the 3rd grade students reported that the elementary resource teachers assisted while parents were cited by 63.6 percent of the 2nd grade and 61.5 percent of the 3rd grade students. Persons mentioned in the "other" category often included volunteers, the building principal or a relative other than a parent.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE - GRADES 4 - 12

Questionnaires were sent to the 716 students that comprised those enrolled in the regular program, grades 4 - 12. A total of 321 questionnaires were returned in a useable format for a response rate of 44.8 percent.

As a follow-up to an item asking respondents to indicate what their goals for participating in the Gifted and Talented Program in 1985-86 were, they were asked to list the activities or projects undertaken to support these goals. They were also asked to check whether or not the activities were listed on their Individual Written Plan (IWP). While listing the activities on the written plan does not guarantee their completion, it does tend to place a focus on the activities and delineate them as those that will receive priority. The plan must be signed by both the student and parent. It is possible that students complete projects that were not on the written plan.

On the questionnaire, item #4 reads "describe the activities or projects you engaged in to meet these goals and indicate whether or not these activities/projects were listed on your Individual Written Plan (IWP)." The purpose of this item was twofold: (a) to determine the percentage of activities/projects supporting student goals that were included on the Individual Written Plan; and (b) to get an idea of how familiar students were with the plan.

Of the 321 respondents to the questionnaire, 262 responded to this item completely. Of the 754 projects listed 510 or 67.6 percent were reported as being included in the written plan. The remaining 244 were

either not included in the IWP or the student did not know whether or not they were. This uncertainty suggests that students may not be familiar with the contents of the plan. While it is understood that the development of the Individual Written Plan occurs early in the year in most cases, some familiarity should be maintained through review of the document in order that proper focus be maintained.

As with students in 2nd and 3rd grade, those in grades 4 - 8 were asked which individuals were particularly helpful to them as they worked on various activities and projects. Responses to this item would indicate which individuals, according to their perceptions, were most involved in their programs. The students were to indicate those most helpful among a classroom teacher other than the gifted and talented building coordinator, the building coordinator, a resource teacher, parent or other person.

The categories of responses are in Table 5 below and are accompanied by the percent of students who responded in each category. It should be noted that most students checked more than one cateogry and some checked all.

TABLE 5
ASSISTANCE FROM ADULTS
IN COMPLETION OF PROJECTS FOR
STUDENTS IN GRADES 4 - 12

	(316 Respondents) N	Percent
Classroom teacher other than gifted and talented building coordinator	162	51.3
Building Gifted and Talented Coordinator	173	54.8
Resource teacher	123	38.9
Parent	150	47.5
Other	105	33.2

Students reported receiving assistance from various sources. The largest percentage of students reported receiving assistance from the building gifted and talented coordinator (54.8 percent), while the least number of students reported receiving assistance from others (33.2 percent) including family members other than parents, peers or community resources. It is interesting to note that only 38.9 percent of the respondents in grades 4 - 12 reported resource teachers as those most helpful to them. In contrast, when 2nd and 3rd grade students responded to this item, 70.0 percent of the 2nd grade and 60.0 percent of the third grade reported that resource teachers were most helpful.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH

The community outreach portion of this program was discussed briefly in the program description section of this report. While there are no guidelines as to the number of students that should have contact with community resources in completing their projects, it is interesting to note the amount of community involvement that did occur. Out of 310 respondents to a question concerning community involvement, 152 (49.0%) reported that the projects or activities worked on involved contact with a resource person from the community. These results are very consistent with those obtained during interviews with a sample of program students and staff during the 1983-84 school year. It would appear from these results that community resources are being utilized in this program when deemed useful. This is a valuable resource for the students as well as an effective public relations contact for the district as a whole.

A key concept in the Gifted and Talented Progam is allowing students to become involved with projects and activities that match their interests to the greatest extent possible while enhancing development in the area of which they are identified. Students were therefore asked, "Do these activities or projects allow you to pursue your particular interests?"

While nearly 10 percent of the students returning the survey did not respond to this item, the 86.6 percent of those who did respond indicated that their activities or projects did allow them to pursue their interests. It is apparent from the responses that students in the program felt they were being provided with the opportunity to engage in activities that are of interest them. This is advantageous as long as input for deciding on activities comes from sources in addition to "interest" alone.

As a final question, students were asked to indicate the extent to which they valued participation in the gifted and talented program on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 = program was "not valuable at all"; to 5 = program was a "very valuable experience.") The responses were grouped according to the following grades: grades 4 - 5 (153 respondents); grades 6 - 8 (110 respondents) and grades 9 - 12 (46 respondents). This was done not only to check for variations between levels (elementary, transitional and senior high), but also to increase the number of respondents in each category because of the relatively low number of students at some grade levels. For respondents in all grades (N=309) the average response was 4.08 on the 5 point scale indicating that on the average students considered the program to be a valuable experience. The degree of value perceived decreased as the student's grade level increased. This is exemplified by the fact that the average response for 4th and 5th grade students was 4.20, for students in grades 6 - 8, 4.04 and for students in grades 9 - 12, 3.76. The reason or reasons for the differences between grade levels are not readily apparent and could be due to a combination of factors. One possibility would be the age of the individuals responding in the various categories, i.e., younger students may simply tend to give more positive responses independent of the program. Another factor could be that the programs offered at the various levels might actually be perceived as different in value by the students. It should be noted that the average responses do not vary significantly among the three levels and are positive at each level.

Students were invited to make comments concerning any aspect of the program at the conclusion of the survey. As there were over 300 respondents in grades 4 - 12, many of whom chose to comment, it would

be difficult to select and quote a sample in this report. All of the comments along with the rest of the survey will be made available to the program coordinator for perusal at the time of completion of this evaluation report.

SUMMARY

This Report of Evaluation is the third since the inception of the Gifted and Talented Program funded by the allowable growth mechanism during the 1983-84 school year. Evaluation designs have been modified from year to year and have been essentially formative (concentrating on monitoring of processes). The program itself has remained much the same though new components have been added.

After several years, it is possible and feasible to develop a summative evaluation design. A summative design, as opposed to merely monitoring processes attempts to judge the value or worth of a program. It is normally not undertaken until a program has been "up and running" for several years, i.e., fully implemented.

A number of sources have been tapped in an attempt to gather evaluative data and monitor program implementation during the past three years. These have included: parents of program students, students themselves, classroom teachers that monitor the progress of program students, building coordinators and the itinerant resource teachers. Interviews were conducted with a random sample of students and staff during the first two years of the program and various questionnaires have been designed and used to measure impact during each year. A series of process objectives were used to monitor various administrative activities during the initial year.

Summative evaluations are difficult in programs that contain a number of different components, as one part of a program may be operating

at an entirely different level of efficiency than another. Another factor that increases the difficulty of summative evaluation in this particular program is the fact that few standards or criteria have been established as guidelines for the extent that certain activities are to occur.

The comments that appear in the next session are written to pull together the information available in a summative fashion. A strong recommendation for the 1986-87 evaluation is that an attempt be made to look more formally at the specific goals of this program and to develop instruments that relate as specifically as possible to measurement of the attainment of these goals.

COMMENTS

1. The Central Academy, a newly established portion of the program that served only 8th grade students in 1985-86, appeared to be a valuable experience for the students involved. On a five point scale, (1 = not valuable at all; 5 = very valuable), participants on the average gave the academy a rating of 3.72.
2. Certain specific logistical areas were identified as causing problems for some Central Academy students. Transportation arrangements were reported as a problem by 66.7%. Maintaining ties with the home school was identified as a problem by 58.8%.
3. Building Coordinators, assigned to each building with a Gifted and Talented Program, identify students, coordinate delivery of services and provide for direct services to the students as major activities. As accurately as can be determined through self-report, these individuals concentrate on activities which are listed as required in their job description. One particular activity which was felt by a majority (69.0%) of the building coordinators to be inappropriate was providing transportation to program activities.
4. Nearly one third (30%) of the students in grades 2 and 3 who responded to a questionnaire indicated that they did not receive assignments different from others in their class. Although the G/T goals discourage an overemphasis on in-class differentiation of students, it would seem that a higher percentage of students should be aware of some differentiation in the classroom activities.
5. Forty-four percent of the students in grades 4-12 responding to a survey reported that 67.6 percent of the projects or activities that they worked on were described in their written plan. The other 32.4 percent of the projects listed, however, were not

part of the plan or the student did not know what was on the plan. While diversions from the plan are allowed and even encouraged in some cases, more students should be at least familiar with what the plan contains and realize that it is intended to serve as a guideline for enrichment activities. Otherwise, it's purpose becomes dubious.

6. Students received assistance from a variety of sources to complete projects and activities. Of the students who responded in grades 2 and 3, 70% reported the resource teacher as particularly helpful. In grades 4-12, 54.8% reported the building coordinator as being very helpful.
7. Nearly one half (49%) of the students in the program sampled reported that community resources were used to assist in the completion of projects and activities.
8. Over 86% of the students sampled in grades 4-12 reported that the projects or activities they engaged in allowed for pursuit of their interests.
9. Students in grades 4-12 completed a five point scale which asked to what extent they felt they had benefited from participation in the program. On a scale of 1 to 5 with "1" indicating that the program was not at all valuable to "5" indicating that the program was a very valuable experience, students in grades 4-5 gave an average response of 4.20. The average for those in grades 6-8 was 4.04 and for those in grades 9-12, 3.76.
10. The percent of minority students participating in this program is disproportionate to the percent of minority students enrolled in the district. While 17.5 percent of the district enrollment is composed of minority students, only 8.3 percent of the Gifted and Talented Program enrollment is made up of same.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The staff of the Saturday G/T Institute should make every effort to increase the rigor demanded of students since the students, themselves, feel the program is only slightly more rigorous than that demanded at their home schools.
2. Logistical factors such as transportation, scheduling and maintenance of ties with the home school were perceived to cause problems for a number of students that attended the Central Academy. It is recommended that the program coordinator take the steps necessary to resolve these problems to the greatest degree possible during the 1986-87 school year.
3. An attempt should be made to make more students aware of the contents of their Individual Written Plan (IWP). While the program permits modification in the plan according to need, students should have a basic familiarity with its contents and be prepared to follow it as a guideline for planning activities.
4. During the 1986-87 school year, the stated goals of this program should be examined to determine whether or not they are being achieved. Some of the goals may need to be stated in more measurable terms to be successfully evaluated. The Department of Evaluation, Research and Testing will assist in this endeavor.
5. It is recommended that the program administration take steps to insure that the representation of minority students in the Gifted and Talented Program is increased. While the number of minority students in the district comprises 17.5 percent of the total district enrollment, the number of minority students in the Gifted and Talented Program make up only 8.3 percent of the program's enrollment.

A copy of the complete Evaluation Report is available upon request from the Department of Evaluation Research and Testing, 1800 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50307-3382.

APPENDIX A

Demographic Information

Des Moines Gifted and Talented Program

1985-86

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
Elementary Buildings
Des Moines Gifted and Talented
1985-1986

School	Grade Level						Sex		Catetory					Race				
	K	1	2	3	4	5	M	F	IN	CR	VP	SA	LE	1	2	3	4	5
Adams	-	-	3	-	1	3	6	1	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
Brooks	-	-	-	3	2	2	4	3	6	-	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	7
Cattell	-	-	1	2	3	3	1	8	8	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	8
Douglas	-	-	1	1	3	7	7	5	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
Edmunds	-	1	1	5	4	7	9	9	13	1	-	5	-	-	2	-	-	16
Findley	-	-	1	-	4	-	3	2	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	4
Garton	-	-	2	1	3	1	5	2	5	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	6
Granger	-	-	1	6	1	1	4	5	9	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	8
Greenwood	-	-	2	6	7	7	8	14	22	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	21
Hanawalt	-	-	2	3	3	3	5	6	11	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	11
Hillis	-	-	1	7	4	3	8	7	13	3	4	-	-	-	-	1	-	14
Howe	-	-	-	2	2	3	2	5	5	-	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	7
Hubbell	-	-	1	2	5	2	5	5	8	3	-	-	-	-	-	-		10
Jackson	-	-	-	2	2	6	5	5	9	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	9
Jefferson	-	-	2	1	4	2	4	5	9	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	9
King	-	1	5	-	-	-	3	3	6	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	6
Longfellow	-	-	2	2	1	4	1	8	9	-	-	-	-	-	4	3	-	2
Lovejoy	-	-	2	2	3	2	7	2	8	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	8
Lucas	-	-	3	-	1	-	2	2	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3
Madison	-	-	-	3	5	-	6	2	8	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	8
Mann	-	-	2	1	1	3	1	6	6	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	6
McKee	-	-	-	-	2	2	1	3	4	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	4
McKinley	-	-	-	1	1	2	2	2	4	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	3
Mitchell	-	1	3	-	1	3	5	3	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	8
Monroe	-	-	-	2	6	2	2	8	10	-	3	2	-	-	1	1	-	8
Moore	-	2	3	2	4	-	9	2	10	3	1	1	1	-	-	1	-	10
Moulton	-	1	-	2	2	5	7	3	1	-	3	8	-	-	-	1	1	8
Oak Park	-	1	-	1	4	3	5	4	6	1	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	8
Park Avenue	-	1	3	4	3	1	7	5	10	1	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	12
Perkins	-	-	-	7	5	9	14	7	20	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	20
Phillips	-	-	-	1	2	3	3	3	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Pleasant Hill	-	1	5	-	-	-	4	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Rice	-	1	5	-	-	-	3	3	5	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Stowe	-	1	1	-	1	3	3	3	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	6
Studebaker	-	-	-	-	2	7	5	4	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
Wallace	-	-	1	4	1	4	6	4	8	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	9
Watrous	-	-	-	-	-	3	2	1	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Willard	-	-	-	1	2	3	2	4	6	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Windsor	-	1	2	2	4	6	4	11	15	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	13
Woodlawn	-	-	1	4	2	4	2	9	11	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
Wright	-	-	3	1	4	2	3	7	10	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
TOTAL	-	12	59	81	105	121	185	193	346	32	27	48	4	2	11	13	4	348

CATEGORIES (Some students are identified in more than one category)
IN = Intellectual Ability
CR = Creative Thinking
VP = Visual and Performing Arts
SA = Specific Academic Aptitude
LE = Leadership

RACE
1 = Native American
2 = Black
3 = Oriental
4 = Hispanic
5 = Caucasian

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
Transitional Buildings
Des Moines Gifted and Talented Program
1985-1986

School	Grade Level			Sex		Category					Race				
	6	7	8	M	F	IN	CR	VP	SA	LE	1	2	3	4	5
Brody	13	3	4	13	7	10	3	2	16	3	-	1	1	-	18
Callanan	11	15	7	21	12	24	5	2	9	3	-	3	1	-	29
Goodrell	7	9	7	15	8	21	3	2	10	-	-	-	2	-	21
Harding	7	5	8	12	8	14	2	2	7	-	-	-	1	-	19
Hiatt	7	5	4	7	9	10	1	1	8	-	-	1	1	-	14
Hoyt	3	6	8	5	12	14	-	4	3	3	-	-	-	-	17
McCombs	7	7	4	11	7	10	5	3	8	1	-	-	2	-	16
Meredith	9	7	6	12	10	15	5	11	8	1	-	1	2	-	19
Merrill	4	6	7	7	10	12	4	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	17
Phillips	3	-	1	4	-	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Watrous	2	4	1	2	5	7	3	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	5
Weeks	5	8	9	7	15	8	3	3	14	2	-	-	1	-	21
TOTAL	78	75	66	116	103	149	35	32	85	14	-	7	12	-	200

CATEGORIES (Some students are identified in more than one category)

IN = Intellectual Ability
CR = Creative Thinking
VP = Visual and Performing Arts
SA = Specific Academic Aptitude
LE = Leadership

RACE

1 = Native American
2 = Black
3 = Oriental
4 = Hispanic
5 = Caucasian

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
Senior High Buildings
Des Moines Gifted and Talented Program
1985-1986

School	Grade Level				Sex		Category					Race				
	9	10	11	12	M	F	IN	CR	VP	SA	LE	1	2	3	4	5
East	17	19	13	11	28	32	31	17	14	33	13	-	2	1	1	56
Hoover	4	15	12	15	21	25	16	12	21	27	6	-	2	1	1	42
Lincoln	17	10	15	10	28	24	23	14	17	24	10	-	-	1	-	51
North	5	3	12	8	10	18	9	6	11	15	7	-	4	2	-	22
Roosevelt	17	23	26	8	39	35	49	22	22	19	7	-	5	2	-	67
Tech	-	-	-	3	2	1	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	3
TOTAL	60	70	78	55	128	135	128	71	85	121	43	-	13	7	2	241

CATEGORIES (Some students are identified in more than one category)

IN = Intellectual Ability
CR = Creative Thinking
VP = Visual and Performing Arts
SA = Specific Academic Aptitude
LE = Leadership

RACE

1 = Native American
2 = Black
3 = Oriental
4 = Hispanic
5 = Caucasian

APPENDIX B

Evaluation Instruments

Des Moines Gifted and Talented Program

1985-86

April 7, 1986

WDear W:

Please assist in the evaluation of the Gifted and Talented Program by responding to the items on the attached questionnaire that concern the Central Academy. Please be assured that your responses will be treated in a confidential manner - names are not required on the response form nor is any other form of identification coding present. Your candid responses will assist in evaluating the program in order to make improvements in the future.

Please return the questionnaire in the envelope provided by April 25, 1986. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

John F. Tompkins,
Program Evaluator

Diane Schnelker,
Research and Evaluation Intern

wp
Enclosure

CENTRAL ACADEMY STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1985 - 1986

1. Please check the program you selected:

   _____social science/language arts block

   _____science/language arts block

2. The third course I enrolled in was

   _____algebra

   _____geometry

   _____Spanish

3. I ____(am)_____(am not) a participant in the regular Gifted and Talented Program.

4. To the best of your knowledge, are academy classes different from those in your home school?

   ____yes ____no

   If yes, how?

5. Please indicate your opinion concerning several factors related to participation in the academy by checking the appropriate responses:

   (a) The arrangements made for transportation to and from the academy were:

Very unsatisfactory	Some problems were encountered	Very satisfactory

   (b) Problems encountered in scheduling other classes because of my participation in the academy were:

Very minor or non-significant	Of some significance	Major

   (c) Maintaining close ties with activities at my home school because of my participation in the academy was:

Very difficult	Somewhat difficult	Not at all difficult

6. Please rate the amount of overall benefit you received from participating in the academy on a scale of 1 to 5 by circling the appropriate number. (1=no benefit; 5=much benefit)

   1 2 3 4 5

7. Would you likely recommend the academy to other qualified students?

_____ Yes _____ Not Sure _____ No

8. Would it be your desire to participate in the academy again (answer does not imply any kind of commitment)?

_____ Yes _____ Not Sure _____ No

9. What changes would you like to see made in any aspect of the academy in the future?

10. What obstacles or conflicts do you foresee should you decide to continue to enroll in the Central Academy?

COMMENTS concerning any aspect of the program:

April 17, 1986

Dear:

Plase assist in the evaluation of the Gifted and Talented Program by responding to the items that concern the Gifted and Talented Institute. Please be assured that your responses will be treated in a confidential manner - names are not required on the response form nor is any other form of identifiaiton coding present. Your candid responses will assist in evaluating the program in order to make improvements in the future.

Please return the questionnaire in the envelope provided by April 25, 1986. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

John F. Tompkins
Program Evaluator

Diane Schnelker
Research and Evaluation Intern

wp
Enclosure

MATH/SCIENCE, HUMANITIES INSTITUTE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1985 - 1986

Institute in which you were enrolled:

MATH AND SCIENCE _____

HUMANITIES _____

Please check the sessions/seminars that you attended:

(Humanities)

_____ The Nuclear Age

_____ Visual and Performing Arts in a Technological Age

_____ Technological Impact Study of Changing Male and Female Roles

_____ Forecasting The Future

(Math/Science)

_____ Biology

_____ Chemistry

_____ Observable and Theoretical Astronomy

_____ Computer Applications

_____ Probability and Statistics

_____ Research Studies in Water Pollution and Treatment

_____ Independent Research

Please indicate your opinion by checking the appropriate response.

1. The Institute provided access to facilities and resources that enabled me to pursue special interests.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. Interaction among students was actively encouraged in sessions/ seminars.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. The activites, projects and studies engaged in were more rigorous than those undertaken in the classroom.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. The activities, projects and studies undertaken were in my opinion critical aspects of the studies of the humanities and/or the sciences.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. Please rate the amount of benefit you received as a result of your participation in the Institute by circling the appropriate number (1=no benefit to 5=much benefit)

1	2	3	4	5
No Benefit		Some Benefit		Much Benefit

6. What changes would you like to see made in any aspect of the Math/Science, Humanities Institute in the future?

7. Would it be your desire to participate in future Gifted and Talented Institute programs (response does not indicate any kind of commitment)?

No	Yes	Not Sure	No

COMMENTS concerning any aspect of the program:

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM
1985-86

Building Coordinator Questionnaire

Listed below are the activities of the building coordinator outlined in the current job description for this position. We are interested in determining the approximate time you spend on each activity, whether you feel each activity is appropriate for the building coordinator and the degree to which you believe these activities facilitated the operation of the 1985-86 Gifted and Talented Program in your building. You need not put your name on the questionnaire. The coding in the upper right corner identifies your building as elementary, transitional or senior high only. Thank you for your assistance.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Please think about the amount of time you spent performing each of the following activities. Classify each activity as one of the following:

   MAJOR: Consuming 30 percent or more of the time you spent working on all Gifted and Talented activities during the school year.

   INTERMEDIATE: Consuming at least 10 percent, but not more than 30 percent of the time you spent on all Gifted and Talented activities during the current school year.

   MINOR: Consuming less than 10 percent of the time you spent on all Gifted and Talented activities during the current school year.

   NOT APPLICABLE: Activity not engaged in.

2. Please indicate the appropriateness of each activity in the space provided (appropriate = should be a building coordinator's responsibility; inappropriate = should not be a building coordinator's responsibility).

3. Please rank, on a scale of 1 to 5, the degree to which you believe each activity facilitated the successful operation of the Gifted and Talented Program in your building during the current school year. Circle the appropriate number (1 = none; 5 = much). If the activity was not engaged in, please indicate by circling NA. (i.e., "Not applicable")

4. Please answer the eight questions on the final page. Feel free to include comments about any aspect of the program.

5. Please return this survey to the Department of Evaluation, Research and Testing by May 2, 1986 in the bag mail.

PLEASE NOTE: All students in the Gifted and Talented Program (3%) in grades 2 and above have also been sent a questionnaire. Their instructions are to return completed forms to you. If you would, please collect the questionnaires and send them via bag mail to the Department of Evaluation, Research and Testing by May 2, 1986. Your assistance in this endeavor is appreciated.

GIFTED AND TALENTED BUILDING COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE
1985-86

Activities	Time	Appropriateness	Facilitation
1. Maintain student files	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
2. Distribute information to identified students.			
a. 3%	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
b. Gifted and Talented Pool	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
3. Insure that parent permission has been obtained before testing.	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
4. Submit write ups of noteworthy building programs and events to building newsletters and other media.	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
5. Coordinate delivery of services to identified students with:			
a. Building staff	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
b. Gifted and Talented resource teachers	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5

c. Parents	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	
d. Volunteers	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	
6. Coordinate support and/or supervision for those providing Gifted and Talented student programs	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	
7. Arrange staff inservice as needed	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	
8. Conduct staff inservice as needed	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	
9. Arrange student transportation to Gifted and Talented experiences	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	
10. Provide student transportation to Gifted and Talented experiences	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	
11. Identify building students following district procedures	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	
12. Screen building records for identification purposes	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	
13. Arrange for direct services to students through pull-out or other programs	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5	

14.	Provide for direct services to students through pull-out or other programs	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
15.	Provide leadership for building teams	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
16.	Prepare reports and lists as needed or according to indicated time schedules	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
17.	Assist teachers in writing IWP's	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
18.	Arrange parent meetings when appropriate	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
19.	Conduct parent meetings when appropriate	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 4
20.	Communicate program's needs and information to building teams, staff and resource teachers	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
21.	Provide opportunities for students to share their products with appropriate audiences	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
22.	Help teachers locate student and professional materials relating to Gifted and Talented	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5
23.	Attend meetings and inservice programs concerning Gifted Education	___ Major ___ Inter ___ Minor ___ N/A	___ Appropriate ___ Inappropriate	NA 1 2 3 4 5

Please answer the following as indicated:

1. How did you spend each week on the average working directly with Gifted and Talented students in your building? (Please check the category that applies.)

   ___ less than 1 hour
   ___ 1 - 2 hours
   ___ 2 - 3 hours
   ___ 3 - 4 hours
   ___ 4 - 5 hours

   If less than 1 hour or more than 5 hours, what would you estimate the amount of time to be? _____

2. How much time did you spend each week on the average working on Gifted and Talented activities, but not directly involved with students?

   ___ less than 1 hour
   ___ 1 - 2 hours
   ___ 2 - 3 hours
   ___ 3 - 4 hours
   ___ 4 - 5 hours
   ___ more than 5 hours

   If less than 1 hour or more than 5 hours, what would you estimate the amount of time to be? _____

3. How much time per week was made available (i.e. released) for you to carry out your assigned duties as building coordinator? (If none, please indicate.) _____

4. How much time per week was made available (i.e. released) for you to work directly with Gifted and Talented students? (If none, please indicate.) _____

5. What program change(s) would you recommend to improve your role as building coordinator?

6. Do you have a list of the names of students who were referred for screening and possible identification during the fall of 1985?

   ___ yes ___ no

7. Is a reocrd showing the results of screening for each of the students referred maintained?

   ___ yes ___ no

8. Who at the building level initiates the screening process for potential participants? (i.e., What is the first step in the screening process?)

9. Comments concerning any aspect of the program:

Dear Student:

Please help us find out more about the gifted and talented program by answering the questions on the next page. Please answer the questions honestly and return the sheet to _____ who is the gifted and talented building coordinator at your school.

Thank you.

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM
1985-86

Student Questionnaire
Grades 2-3

1. What grade are you in this year? _____

2. Do you get classroom assignments that are different from other students in your class?

   ___ yes ___ no

3. How many other students in your class are in the gifted and talented program? _____

4. Do you get to work with these students on special assignments?

   ___ yes ___ no

   If so, could you describe those assignments or activities?

5. Did you get to work with gifted and talented students from other classes?

   ___ yes ___ no

   If so, how many were from other grades? _____

   What activities did you work on with these students?

6. Please check which adults helped you complete these activities?

   ___ Your homeroom teacher

   ___ A teacher other than your homeroom teacher

   ___ Resource teacher

   ___ Parent

   ___ Other Who? _____

Dear Student:

Please help us evaluate the gifted and talented program by answering the questions on the attached pages. Your answers will be kept confidential and will be summarized with the answers from other students. Please answer the questions openly and honestly in the space provided and return the questionnaire to _____ who is the gifted and talented building coordinator at your school.

Thank you.

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM
1985-86

Student Questionnaire
Grades 4-12

1. What grade are you in this year? _____

2. Please check the category or categories in which you are identified for the gifted and talented program:

   ___ Intellectual

   ___ Creativity

   ___ Visual/performing arts

   ___ Leadership

   ___ Subject area Please specify _____

3. Describe your goals for participating in the gifted and talented program this year.

4. Describe the activities or projects you engaged in to meet these goals and indicate whether or not these activities/projects were listed on your Individual Written Plan (IWP).

Activity/Project	Listed on IWP (Please check for each activity)		
	Yes	No	Don't Know

5. Please check which individuals were particularly helpful to you as you worked on these activities and projects.

___ Classroom teacher other than gifted and talented building coordinator

___ Building gifted and talented coordinator

___ Resource teacher

___ Parent

___ Other Please specify _____

6. Did any of the projects or activities that you worked on involve contact with a resource person from the community (i.e., outside the school system)?

___ Yes ___ No

If yes, please describe briefly.

7. Describe any obstacles that interfered with accomplishing your activities or projects.

8. Did these activities or projects allow you to pursue your particular interests?

___ yes ___ no

If not, describe what you would have enjoyed doing instead.

9. Please indicate the components of the gifted and talented program in which you participated:

___ Central Academy (8th grade only)

___ Institute

___ Summer program

___ Pull-out program

10. Which of the components in #9 was the <u>most beneficial</u> to you?

11. Please indicate the extent to which you valued your participation in the gifted and talented program by circling the appropriate number.

1	2	3	4	5
Not valuable at all (i.e., a waste of time)				A very valuable experience

12. Comments concerning any aspect of the program: